

# The North Carolina Standard.

THOMAS LORING,

EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

THE CONSTITUTION AND THE UNION OF THE STATES—THEY "MUST BE PRESERVED."

RALEIGH, N. C. WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1840.

VOL. VI.—NO. 278.

THREE DOLLARS PER ANNUM.

## TERMS:

THE NORTH CAROLINA STANDARD is published weekly, at three dollars per annum—payable yearly in advance. A subscriber failing to give notice of his desire to discontinue at the expiration of the period for which he may have paid, will be considered as having subscribed anew, and the paper continued, at the option of the Editor, until ordered to be stopped; but no paper will be discontinued, until all arrearages are paid.

Advertisements, not exceeding fourteen lines, will be inserted on time for one dollar, and twenty-five cents for each subsequent insertion; those of greater length in proportion. If the number of insertions be not marked on them, they will be continued until ordered out.

Charged Advertisements and Sheriff's Sales, will be charged twenty-five per cent. higher than the usual rates.

A deduction of 33 1/3 per cent. will be made to those who advertise by the year.

\* Letters to the Editor must come free of postage, or they may not be attended to.

## REMARKS

OF  
MR. WATTERSON,

Of Tennessee,

House of Representatives, Jan. 16, 1840.

On the subject of Abolition petitions.

MR. SPEAKER:—Differing as I do from a portion of my colleagues upon this subject, I feel that it is my duty to state some of the reasons which influence my course. I did hope, sir, that on the exciting and important question now under consideration, it would be my good fortune to battle, arm to arm and shoulder to shoulder, with all the Representatives from the State of Tennessee. It is to me a source of deep mortification that any Southern man should hesitate a moment in regard to the proper disposition of Abolition petitions, much less pursue a course which in my judgment, is playing into the hands of those miserable fanatics. The resolution offered by the gentleman from Louisiana, (Mr. CHINN), proposing to receive and refer to a committee all memorials and petitions relating to the abolition of slavery in the District, in the Territories, or in the States, concedes every thing the Abolitionists are contending for at this time, and I must be permitted to express my great astonishment at the source from which it originated. Coming as he does from one of the largest slaveholding States in the Union, I regard the move as extremely unfortunate; but not more so than the zealous and able support which it has received from some of my colleagues and others of the same political party, who hail from the South. Sir, are not the votes of every Abolitionist in the House recorded upon the journal in favor of suspending the rule, for the purpose of adopting it? Did not the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, (Mr. ADAMS), when a similar proposition was suggested by one of my colleagues, (Mr. BELL), arise in his place and declare that it was all he desired? Well do the Abolitionists know that the goal of universal emancipation cannot be reached, but by degrees—that the ramparts of the Constitution cannot be torn down in a day or a week; and that if they can gain a single point at a time, they may ultimately succeed, in eradicating slavery, not in the District of Columbia alone, but in the several States—and at the same time under the cords that bind together this glorious Union. Sir, I would rather these conspirators against the perpetuity of this Republic, and the rights and tranquility of its citizens, should prate about grievances, which, if they exist at all, cannot affect them, to the end of time, than to acknowledge by my vote, that I am bound to receive, refer, and treat with common respect their petitions, which ask me to violate the Constitution of my country, which I have solemnly sworn to support. If we are to have peace upon such terms only, I, for one, am against peace. But have we so soon forgotten the past? Does not every gentleman upon this floor recollect, that the same argument was used in 1835, in favor of the reference of these petitions to a committee—that then, as now, it was contended, that such reference would be the most effectual mode of tranquillizing the public mind, and staying all further agitation of the subject on the part of the Abolitionists? Under this delusive hope, such a committee was raised, on the motion of a distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, (Mr. Pickens). That committee went to work, and made an able reply against the prayer of the petitioners, and what was the effect? Was the voice of Abolition hushed? Did their insulting and infamous petitions cease to pour in to this House? Were the rights and feelings of the South any more respected? Let your journals for the last three years answer. Session after session are we called upon to repel their assaults against our domestic institutions, our homes, and our friends. Instead of allaying, as it was alleged would be the case, it has increased their exertions. Shall we, then, resort to an experiment, which has already so signally failed? To do so would be nothing but downright madness. Better, far better, to stand firm like men, and give way on no part of the ground. If we once commence retreating, they will never cease their demands, until they have accomplished their unhallowed purposes. But the Abolitionists and their apologists contend that to refuse acting on these petitions is a violation of that article in the Constitution, which prohibits Congress from passing any law abridging the "right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances." This I deny. Have we passed any law, or are we about to pass any law, abridging this right? Surely not. The people are at liberty to "peaceably assemble" at any time—and to petition upon any subject; but when it is presented here by an honorable member, by the rules of the House which we have adopted for our government, he has to state its contents; and after hearing such statement, are we not prepared to say whether it is of such a character as would justify us in rejecting it at once? By way of illustration, suppose the fanatics of Massachusetts, or any other State, should take it into their heads to send petitions to the Legislature of Tenn. asking them to pass a law authorizing and empowering our slaves to cut all our throats by a given time, would it be a denial of the right of petition not to receive and refer them?

Again: suppose the hot-headed Southerners, believing that the venerable ex-President who sits across the way, was most essentially deranged upon the subject of slavery, and that by his course in this House their lives and their property were endangered, should ask Congress to enact a law, sending him to some place of confinement the remainder of a long and eventful life, would not the gentleman himself admit, that this was an abuse of the right of petition; or, in other words that we would not be bound to receive and consider it? Gentlemen declare if we will only receive and refer Abolition petitions, it is all they wish; the House can then put the "broad seal" of condemnation upon them as soon as they please. Such declarations resolve themselves into this; that to refuse to receive and refer their petitions, is a gross insult; but the moment after reception and reference, we may commit them to the flames, without offence! Most logical and happy thought truly! But I am not willing to trust them. Let us mark our indignation at the objects they have in view, by a prompt and decisive vote at the threshold. Let us say to them that we have no power to legislate on the subject; and if we had, it could not be exercised, without tearing down the fairest fabric that human wisdom ever reared, and spreading havoc and ruin where there is now peace and prosperity.

Mr. Speaker, by refusing to receive these petitions after we have heard their contents stated by the introducer, or by laying them on the table without any further action upon them, we avoid debate on this distracting subject. Sir, every debate here may kindle the fires of insurrection in the South. Let me ask, how can debate be prevented, if we receive, and refer them to a committee? The moment that reference is made, a member rises in his place, holds up a resolution in his hand, and demands its adoption. What is it? It is a resolution instructing the committee to report in favor of the prayer of the Abolitionists. He has the floor; no other member can get it, in order to move the previous question; and he proceeds for hours, if not days, to plead the cause of these incendiaries. Every word he utters through the secret agency of the Abolitionists, finds its way to the ears of the slave population of the South, and may excite them to rebellion and massacre. But, sir, suppose you succeed in applying the previous question at the close of this speech; cannot another member, and another, and so on, until the whole number is exhausted, bring forward resolutions of the like kind, and in that way keep up an everlasting debate in this House, and an everlasting disturbance out of it? This must be the inevitable result of receiving and referring such papers to a committee. Unlike my two colleagues, (Messrs. GENTRY and BELL), I can never consent to such a reception and reference. It must lead to interminable discussion; and discussion here, I fear, will lead to the most direful consequence.

The gentleman from the city of New York (Mr. MONROE) has declared that the battle of Abolitionism must be fought at the North. Must be fought in the North, and by whom, sir? The political party (Whig) to which he is attached? If so, I have solemn apprehensions that our rights will be in peculiarly bad keeping! Sir, were they fighting the battles of the South, when they were supporting a notorious Abolitionist (Mr. Bradish) for Lieutenant Governor of New York, when they gave him about nineteen thousand votes in the city, and near one hundred and fifty thousand in the State? Were they fighting the battles of the South, when they were rallying around the black standard, of an Abolitionist for Governor of Pennsylvania in 1838? I mean Joseph Ritner, who received the full Whig vote in that State; and will any member present deny it? If so, let him speak. I hold in my hand a message which he delivered to the Legislature, December, 1836, and would ask leave to read a short extract from it. After speaking of the "base bowing of the knee to the dark spirit of slavery," he said:

"Opposition to the admission into the Union of new slaveholding States, and opposition to slavery in the District of Columbia, the very heart and abode of the national honor, have ever been, and are the cherished doctrines of our State. Let us, fellow-citizens, stand by and maintain them unshrinkingly and fearlessly."

Here are "cherished" Abolition "doctrines" for you! But, sir, the voice of the ballot boxes, in tones of thunder declared, that this message contained foul slanders upon the sound Republican principles of Pennsylvania! Ritnerism and Abolitionism were overthrown, and the banner of Democracy again waved its broad folds over that ancient Commonwealth.

Were they fighting the battles of the South, at the late Harrisburg Convention, when they nominated a candidate for the Presidency, who is in favor of appropriating the surplus revenue to the emancipation of slaves? Only hear him: "Should I be asked if there is no way by which the General Government can aid the cause of EMANCIPATION, I answer that it has long been an object near my heart, to see the whole of ITS SURPLUS REVENUE APPROPRIATED TO THAT OBJECT."

Were they fighting the battles of the South, when they elected Abolitionists Governor and Lieutenant Governor of Vermont? Sir, I regret to say, that I have seen the success of these men trumpeted, even in my own State, by the Whig newspapers, as a Whig victory. "Vermont erect!" "Vermont ever true to her principles!" and like joyful exclamations, have frequently graced their columns, on hearing of a Whig Abolition triumph in that State. Heaven save the Democracy from all such triumphs!

In the State of Ohio, I understand, there was a line of Abolitionists from the Ohio river to the Lakes, who aided the slaves of Kentucky to escape into Canada. So frequent were the complaints on this score, that the Legislature of Kentucky sent commissioners to the Legislature of Ohio, asking them to pass a law punishing in future all such kidnappers. Accordingly, such a law was promptly enacted, in conformity with the wishes of Kentucky and the principles of common honesty. I believe it was termed the "Fugitive act." But mark ye: in the House of Representatives there were twenty-three votes against the bill, all of whom were Whigs, "good and true." In the Senate there were fourteen negative votes, and not a Democrat amongst the number. Now, I would ask the gentleman from New York, (Mr. MONROE) if these thirty-seven leading Whigs were fighting the battles of the South?

Were the Whig party fighting the battles of the South, when they were passing, and endeavoring to pass, Abolition resolutions in the Legislatures of New York, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Vermont, Connecticut, and several other States.

Was the present Whig Governor of Connecticut, fighting the battles of the South, when in his very first message he thundered his denunciations against Southern institutions?

Was his Whig Excellency, Gov. Seward, of New York, fighting the battles of the South when he recently refused the demand of the Governor of Virginia for three fugitives from justice, charged with having "stolen and carried away from the State of Virginia a negro slave, the property of a citizen of the borough of Norfolk?" Was he afraid of offending his Abolition friends, who published a circular immediately before the New York election, in 1838, to the "Anti-slavery electors" of that State, urging them to cast their votes for him and against Governor Marcy, the Democratic candidate? Here it is. Let the South make their own comments.

CIRCULAR.  
TO THE ANTI-SLAVERY ELECTORS OF THE STATE OF NEW-YORK.

We ask the privilege of brethren to set forth briefly, but frankly, the reasons which constrain us to cast our votes for Wm. H. Seward for Governor. 1. Mr. Seward is the candidate of the party which, on the floor of Congress, nobly vindicates the inalienable right of petition, and as nobly asserts the freedom of debate; of the party, also, that sustains John Quincy Adams and William Slade; of a party whose views are liberal and tolerant. 2. Mr. Seward is the candidate of the party which, in our last Legislature, passed resolutions against the admission of Texas into the Union; against Patton's gag resolutions; in favor of the right of petition; and in favor of granting trial by jury to persons claimed as fugitive slaves. Instead of the denunciations and revilings with which our petitions were treated in years past—instead of threatening us with penal enactments, the Whigs received and treated petitions and remonstrances with that respect and comity due to their constituents.

3. Mr. Seward is the candidate of the party that opposes the re-election of a President who stands pledged to veto any bill abolishing slavery in the District of Columbia. 4. Mr. Seward is the candidate opposed to Governor Marcy, who, in his messages to the Legislature, has manifested, in sentiment and sympathy, the bitterest hostility to our cause; and who, as the presiding officer of a public meeting, while he was Governor of the State, recommended the passage of laws authorizing a violation of the rights of the fugitive, pains and penalties upon those who were disseminating intelligence and truth.

5. The re-election of Gov. Marcy would go very far towards the re-election of Martin Van Buren, whose measures and policy are so hostile to the cause of human liberty. And, finally, because our knowledge of Mr. Seward leads us to confide in the general soundness and integrity of his principles. We view the great question of a Sub-Treasury, a National Bank, or the currency, of minor importance, compared with the great subject of human liberty; and believing that the election of Mr. Seward, and the defeat of Governor Marcy, will best promote the great cause of universal emancipation, we shall vote for him ourselves, and recommend our Abolition friends to do the same.

We are, respectfully, your fellow-citizens,  
JEFFERSON MAYELL,  
President Albany Young Men's  
Anti-Slavery Society.  
CALVIN PEPPER, Jr.,  
Vice President.  
JOHN WILSON,  
Corresponding Secretary.  
H. CARPENTER,  
First Vice President.  
WILLIAM GIBSON,  
One of the Executive Committee Young Men's  
Albany Anti-Slavery Society.  
NORMAN FRANCIS,  
Chairman of the Executive Committee of Young Men's Albany Anti-Slavery Society.

S. A. HASTINGS,  
A. McCURE,  
J. McCURE,  
FORDYCE SYLVESTER,  
JAMES E. McCURE,  
S. B. HALL.

I come now, Mr. Speaker, to the journal of the House of Representatives for the last session of Congress, and will show by the yeas and nays how certain members voted upon a resolution, against the right of Congress to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia and in the Territories, with a view to its abolition in the States.—But, before I proceed, I would make a single remark in regard to the author of these resolutions, (Mr. ATHERTON, of New Hampshire).—His course has been denounced by the gentleman from New York, (Mr. GRANGER), who charged him with being influenced alone by the strong tie of party and party drill. Sir, judging his motives from his acts, he was governed by a much higher consideration—a desire to stand fast to the Constitution, though he might fall in the conflict. Instead of meriting the censure, he deserves the gratitude of the whole country. In the name, and on behalf of my constituents, I tender him my heartfelt thanks.—Would to heaven we had more such men from the North.

I find, upon examination, that fifty-two Representatives voted against the second of the following resolutions. I shall read them both, because the latter refers to the first:

Resolved, That Congress has no right to do that indirectly which it cannot do directly; and that the agitation of the subject of slavery in the District of Columbia, or the Territories, as a means, and with the view, of disturbing or overthrowing that institution in the several States, is against the true spirit and meaning of the Constitution, an infringement of the rights of the States affected, and a breach of the public faith upon which they entered into the Confederacy.

Resolved, therefore, That all attempts on the part of Congress to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, or the Territories, or to prohibit the removal of slaves from State to State, or to discriminate between the institutions of one portion of the Confederacy and another, with the views aforesaid, are in violation of the Constitution, destructive of the fundamental principle on which the union of these States rests, and beyond the jurisdiction of Congress.

Out of the fifty-two votes that were given against the last resolution, forty-eight were Whigs, embracing nearly the entire Whig strength from the non-slaveholding States in this House at that time. I give their names, and the States which they respectively represented:

MASSACHUSETTS WHIGS.—John Quincy Adams, Nathaniel B. Borden, George N. Briggs, William B. Calhoun, Caleb Cushing, Richard Fletcher, George Grinnell, jr., William S. Hastings, Levi Lincoln, John Reed, and Leverett Saltonstall.

PENNSYLVANIA WHIGS.—Edward Darlington, Edward Davies, Thomas Henry, Thos. M. T. McKennan, Charles Naylor, and David Potts, jr.

VERMONT WHIGS.—Heman Allen, Horace Everett, Hiram Hall, and William Slade.

NEW YORK WHIGS.—John Edwards, (Con.) Millard Filmore, Henry A. Foster, (Con.) Abraham F. Grant, (Con.) Richard P. Marvin, Charles F. Mitchell, Luther C. Peck, David Russell, Mark H. Sibley, Timothy Childs, and Harvey Putnam.

OHIO WHIGS.—James Alexander, jr., Joshua R. Giddings, Patrick G. Gode, Sampson Mason, and Calvary Morris.

NEW JERSEY WHIGS.—John B. Ayer, jr., William Halsed, John P. B. Maxwell, and Charles C. Stratton.

INDIANA WHIGS.—George H. Dunn, William Herod, and James Raviden.

MAINE WHIGS.—George Evans, Joseph C. Noyes, and Edward Robinson.

RHODE ISLAND WHIGS.—Robert B. Cranston, and Joseph L. Tillinghast.

Might I not, Mr. Speaker, again ask the gentleman from New York, if these Whig leaders were fighting the battles of the South, when they were declaring by their votes, as I have shown, that they believe Congress has the power to legislate on the subject of slavery in this District and in the Territories, to the end that it may be overthrown in the several States? Sir, should ever the practical administration of the Government unfortunately get into the hands of men holding to such principles, I awfully fear that the days of this Republic are numbered.

Mr. Speaker, it is certainly an alarming state of affairs, if it has become necessary for one of the great political parties to favor the views of the Abolitionists to any extent, in order to receive their aid in the election of a President. I would hope it is not so. But when I reflect upon the causes which operated in favor of the late Harrisburg nomination, I must confess that I am not without my doubts. It is a fact which cannot be successfully denied, that it had not been for the influence of the Abolitionists, another distinguished gentleman (Mr. CLAY) would have been the Whig candidate for the next Presidency. Let it be borne in mind, let it never be forgotten, that Gen. Harrison did not receive a single vote in the Harrisburg Convention from a slaveholding State; and is it not marvellous, that while every Southern delegate in the Harrisburg Convention opposed the nomination of Harrison, now, when it is known his nomination was effected by the influence of Abolitionism, against the will of the South, the whole Southern Federal delegation in Congress have embraced him as their candidate? When the nomination reached New York, what joy pervaded the ranks of the Abolitionists! The Emancipator could not restrain his feelings. It sounded this note of triumph in the excess of its rhapsody:

"THE HARRISBURG CONVENTION.—Well, the agony is over, and Henry Clay is laid upon the shelf; and no man of ordinary intelligence can doubt or deny that it is the Antislavery victory of the North which has done this. Let the slaveholders and ostentatious and infamous pro-slavery demonstrations in Congress. Praise to God for a great Antislavery victory! A man of high talents, of great distinction, of long political services, of boundless personal popularity, has been openly rejected for the Presidency of this Republic on account of his devotion to slavery. Set up a monument of progress there. Let the winds tell the tale. Let the slaveholders hear the news. Let foreign nations hear it. Let O'Connell hear it. Let the slaves hear it. A slaveholder is incapacitated for the Presidency of the U. States. The reign of slaveocracy is hastening to a close. The rejection of Henry Clay by the Whig Convention, taken in connection with all the circumstances, is one of the heaviest blows which has been dealt to slavery in this country."

Such was the language of a leading Abolition paper, published in the city of New York. But I have more evidence of the same character, showing the manner in which Harrison's nomination was received by the Abolitionists. The Boston Liberator, edited by the notorious and infamous Garrison, came out with a similar article. Hear him:

NOMINATION OF GENERAL HARRISON.—The National Whig Convention, assembled at Harrisburg on the 6th instant, nominated William Henry Harrison for the office of President of the United States. On the first and second ballot, the vote stood for Henry Clay, 103; for Harrison, 94; for Winfield Scott, 57. On the third ballot, the vote was for Harrison, 148; for Clay, 90; for Scott, 16. All the slave States went for Clay. We regard this as another important sign of the times—as a signal defeat of the slaveholding power in this country. Had it not been for Abolitionism, Henry Clay would undoubtedly have been nominated.—We have faith to believe that no slaveholder will ever again be permitted to fill the Presidential office in this Republic."

Sir, if it were necessary, I could introduce evidence upon evidence, proving to a demonstration that Abolitionism did the work at Harrisburg; that Henry Clay was "laid upon the shelf," in consequence of the anti-Abolition sentiments which he avowed in a speech during the last session of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I rejoice that whilst this dark cloud of Abolitionism is hanging over the country, that we have a pilot at the helm of state, whose views are so sound upon the subject, that he had been denounced upon this floor and elsewhere, as a "Northern man with Southern principles"—by which I presume it is meant that he is a Northern man, with Republican principles. If so, I yield to the justness of the denunciation.

Sir, I assert that no man can be a Republican and an Abolitionist. The two terms are totally inconsistent, as much so as those of Democrat and Federalist. Gentleman may specify a scattering Abolitionist, here and there who occasionally co-operates with the Democratic party, from local causes, but all his principles, feelings, and sympathies incline him towards the Opposition. Moreover, the Democrats, as a party, have repudiated the doctrines of the Abolitionists. Look at the inaugural of the President, who stands pledged to veto any bill interfering with slavery in this District. Look at the address of the Democratic members of Congress to the people of the United States. Look at their votes in the various State Legislatures. Look at their resolves in their conventions, and in their primary meetings, and you will find abundant evidence of the truth of this assertion. Well did Mr. Jefferson remark, that the "Democracy of the North are the natural allies of the South."—Sir, I am proud of that alliance. We fight in one common cause, and under one common banner. That cause is the Constitution of our country.

That banner the same, which has so proudly waved over the Republican party, from the foundation of this Government.

## APPENDIX AND PROOF.

In Mr. STANLEY's reply to Mr. WATTERSON, he read a publication of Mr. PARMENTER, a Democratic Representative from the State of Massachusetts, which he thought committed him to the cause of the Abolitionists.

Mr. PARMENTER did not know if he understood precisely what the gentleman from North Carolina meant by an Abolitionist. I should like to hear him refer to any remark or writing of mine on that subject, or to any vote I have given, other than for the reference to a committee.

Mr. STANLEY said he should like to know what the gentleman himself considered an Abolitionist, and read a letter written by Mr. PARMENTER, in which he gave his opinions on the subject of abolition.

Mr. PARMENTER said that, in the State of Massachusetts, it was essential to the quality of an Abolitionist that he should wish Congress immediately to adopt measures to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia and the Territories, without any regard to the consequences. It was true that he, in common with a very large portion of the people of Massachusetts, believed slavery to be a very great evil; and would be glad if it could be abolished without disturbing the peace and harmony of the Union, or violating the rights of others. Mr. PARMENTER added that the letter read by the gentleman from North Carolina, was not considered to be in accordance with the views of the Abolitionists, and accordingly they all voted in a body against him.

Mr. STANLEY went on with his remarks, and spoke of a number of distinguished members of the Democratic party whom he stigmatised as Abolitionists. Mr. S. read some extracts from an address of Mr. Morton, whose recent election as Governor of Massachusetts, the Democratic party hailed as a triumph, to show that he also was an Abolitionist.

Mr. PARMENTER wished to make one remark in relation to Mr. Morton, the Governor elect of Massachusetts. The gentleman had read some extracts where Gov. Morton spoke his sentiments very strongly against slavery. But the gentleman did not draw the distinction between anti-slavery and Abolitionism. The one was a mere matter of belief, while the other was an intention to carry its objects into effect without any regard to the consequences. He would make another remark.—The Abolition paper printed at Boston opposed the election of Governor Morton, and recommended it to the Abolitionists to support another candidate. Mr. F. wished the gentleman would define his ideas of Abolition more distinctly.

Mr. STANLEY said he wished the gentleman would define his.

Mr. PARMENTER said he would define what he considered to be the views of an Abolitionist. It was a desire that Congress should abolish slavery in this District, and in the Territories, without regard to the rights of others, the peace and tranquility of a large portion of the country, and the safety of the Union.

In addition to Mr. PARMENTER's remarks, I would state that there were four trials in his district before he was elected. Levi Farwell was the candidate of the Abolitionists, and Nathan Brooks the Whig candidate. Before the fourth trial, Mr. Farwell declined in favor of Mr. Brooks. Whereupon the Abolitionists issued a circular to their friends, urging them to vote in favor of Mr. Brooks. I subjoin the circular, as well as Mr. Farwell's letter.

## TO THE ABOLITIONISTS.

Pause and consider, we beseech you, before you again throw away your votes. The District must not, cannot, go unrepresented. You cannot choose a candidate of your own. Of course Mr. Brooks or Mr. Parmenter will be eventually elected, and can you hesitate a moment for which of them to vote? Mr. Parmenter is pledged to the support of Mr. Van Buren, who has thrown himself into the arms of Southern slaveholders, and he is irrevocably pledged to war against abolition every where and at all times. Mr. Parmenter and his party re- viled and abused you. They regard abolition as a "disease," and contemptuously call it "Nemorephobia," and declare it to be "decidedly worse than hydrophobia." From them the poor slave has nothing but sneers and abuse.

Will you not avenge yourselves by giving your support to Mr. Brooks, whose votes in the Senate prove him to be the slave's true friend, and who, in the opinion of the Hon. Samuel Hoar, and Hon. Levi Farwell, and many other respectable Abolitionists, is worthy of your entire confidence. If, by doing so, you can effect his election, would not your votes be "emphatically votes for liberty?" Your former pledges to scatter your votes have been thrice redeemed, and are no longer binding on you. Follow the example of the Abolitionists in other towns, who are determined "nobly to maintain principle," and cast your votes as patriotism and humanity dictate.

Read the following letter, and then pause, before you give your votes for slavery!!!

## MR. FARWELL'S LETTER.

CAMBRIDGE, March 20, 1839.

GENTLEMEN: Inasmuch as, at your former session, you have seen fit to propose my name as one of the candidates to be voted for at the Congressional election, you will, I trust, excuse me in requesting that my name may not again be used for that purpose; first, because that, under no circumstance likely to occur, could I undertake to serve the district in that capacity; and secondly, because, from my long acquaintance with Mr. Brooks, and from his acquiescence in the Senate of Massachusetts, I cannot but feel that his sentiments on the subject of slavery are such as to entitle him to the entire confidence of Abolitionists.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

LEVI FARWELL.

To the Abolition Convention sitting this day at Concord.

The following is the article from the Liberator, (alluded to by Mr. PARMENTER,) calling upon the Abolitionists to support the Whig candidate for Governor, Edward Everett, at the late election for Governor in Massachusetts.

## TO ABOLITIONISTS!

We recommend to the attention of our Abolition brethren the following paragraph, which is a literal copy of the whole of an editorial paragraph in the last Liberator, written by Mr. Garrison:

EDWARD EVERETT.

The Governor of this Commonwealth has answered unequivocally in the AFFIRMATIVE to the questions, whether he is in favor of the immediate Abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, and the slave trade between the several States. Edward Everett now speaks the language of a patriot, a Republican, and a Christian. We believe it is the real language of his soul. When, a few years since, he took opposite ground, he did violence to his convictions of right, and committed a grievous error. We are disposed to obliterate that has gone before, and to commend him for his present honorable course. To refer individually to what he said when public sentiment was deeply corrupt, would be ungenerous; to charge him with being insincere at the present time would be unjust; to accuse him of seeking popularity would be equally uncharitable. It is not yet a popular thing for the Chief Magistrate of this Commonwealth to

avow himself in favor of immediate emancipation, and until he shall prove recreant to his present professions, it is to be taken for granted that he means just what he says. In our opinion, he ought to receive the undivided support of the anti-slavery voters of this Commonwealth; nay, they have pledged to him their support, inasmuch as he has declared himself to be in favor of their principles and measures.

We likewise recommend to the attention of our Abolition brethren the following unmitigated and literal extract from a communication in the same paper, by "A Member of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Board."

GOV. EVERETT'S LETTER IS SATISFACTORY. His endorsing Mr. Alvord's report does not weaken his answer, but strengthens it, for that report was full of the soundest Abolition doctrines. THE GOVERNOR SHOULD REJECT THE VOTE OF EVERY ABOLITIONIST. Some, who call themselves such, but whose hearts are more with their party than with the slave, may still go back to Edward Everett's old misdeeds. Let me tell them this is unfair. In the circumstances of the case, it is almost treacherous. Mr. Borden asked Governor Everett's opinions, not as an individual, but as representing the Abolitionists generally. The Governor answers at once and unequivocally. His for us to turn round, and charge him with inconsistency? This would be a gross outrage. Why did we ask him, if we did not mean to judge him by his answer?

Judge Morton's and Mr. Willis's letters are very much alike. They give no information. They do not answer the simplest of all possible questions, so that a plain man can tell what they mean. Judge Morton refers to a letter written two years ago, which, when you look at it, is no more of a reply than the present. That letter contained some very handsome and flowing periods about his detestation of slavery, &c. &c. I, perhaps, served its purpose pretty well in its day; what would do for 1837, will not do for 1839. These vague professions of Judge Morton amount to just nothing at all. There is nothing in them you can put your finger on. If the Abolitionists are to be satisfied with such unmeaning generalities, let me tell you, the politicians will never give them anything else.

Mr. STANLEY also read a letter of Mr. WILLIAMS, of Massachusetts, in which strong opposition to slavery was expressed. Whether Mr. WILLIAMS is, or is not, an Abolitionist, I know not. But I have it from a source which cannot be questioned: that his Whig opponent for Congress (Nath'l B. Borden) was an active member, if not President of an Anti-Slavery Society, and was supported by Garrison's Liberator, in Boston, the organ of the Abolitionists in that State, which opposed Mr. WILLIAMS, and did not consider him as coming up to their views. Moreover, I find, by reference to the journal of the last session of Congress, that Mr. Borden voted against Mr. ATHERTON's resolutions throughout—even against that resolution which declares that Congress has no power to do that indirectly, which it cannot do directly.

One of the largest Democratic conventions ever held in the State of Ohio, was held at Columbus on the 8th of January, instant. Among other resolutions which were unanimously adopted, I find the following in regard to Abolition. They go the full length in support of Southern institutions:

Resolved, That, in the opinion of this convention, Congress ought not, without the consent of the people of the District, and of the States of Virginia and Maryland, to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia; and that the efforts now making for that purpose, by organized societies in the free States, are hostile to the spirit of the Constitution, and destructive to the harmony of the Union.

Resolved, That slavery being a domestic institution recognised by the Constitution of the United States, we, as citizens of a free State, have no right to interfere with it, and that the organising of societies and associations in free States, in opposition to the institutions of sister States, while production of no good, may be the cause of much mischief; and while such associations for political purposes ought to be discountenanced by every lover of peace and concord, no sound democrat will have part or lot with them.

Resolved, That political Abolitionism is but ancient Federalism under a new guise, and that the political action of anti-slavery societies, is only a device for the overthrow of Democracy.

Before the New York election in 1838, the black abolitionists of the city of New York held a meeting, at which they adopted resolutions "earnestly" requesting their "colored brethren" to vote the "WHOLE WHIG TICKET." Their proceedings are subjoined.

ALL MEN ARE BORN FREE AND EQUAL!  
To the Colored Citizens of the city and county of New York.

At a respectable and numerous meeting of the colored freeholders of this city, held at Wilberforce Hall, Mr. John Fort was called to the chair, and William Johnson was appointed Secretary. After the minutes of the previous meeting was read, Mr. Fort, the chairman, moved that the minutes be so amended as to read, "that the colored citizens of New York be earnestly requested to vote the

## WHOLE WHIG TICKET.

Nominated at Masonic Hall," which, after considerable discussion, was adopted. It was then moved and adopted:

1. That WM. H. SEWARD, having in his letter to the committee of Abolitionists, shown himself more friendly to the abolition of all distinctions, as far as regards COLOR, than the candidates of the Democratic party, we agree to give him our unanimous support.

2. That LUTHER BRADISH has shown himself the unequalled friend of human rights, and, in consequence, shall receive the votes of every colored citizen in this city.

3. That the Congress and Legislative ticket of the Whig party shall also receive our support.

The following gentlemen were then appointed a Vigilance Committee.

THADDEUS SLAY, JOHN PIER, JOHN BONSER, GEORGE DOUGLASS, TERENCE SAMPLE, HANNIBAL ALLEN, JOHN BLAKE, CATO SMITH, PARKER DOWNING, WM. JOHNSON, CESAR MOTT, JOHN SMITH, ANTHONY MOORE, JOHN FORD, President.

WM. JOHNSON, Secretary.

The Vigilance Committee will be in attendance at this place during the three days of the election. Our friends who were not at the meeting will please provide themselves with tickets by calling on the members of the Colored Whig Freeholders Vigilance Committee.

The following confidential circular was also sent to the Whig Abolitionists, by Arthur Tappan, previous to the New York elections in 1838.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed you have a list of the publications by this Society, to which you will please direct any of our Whig friends who may desire a knowledge of the truth. I am gratified that our Abolition friends are to be found